

The Obama administration displayed little resolve and did not respond with force—instead it made a deal with the Russians so supposedly destroy the Assad regime's chemical weapons stockpiles. But last spring we saw the Syrians use chemical weapons again. Fortunately the Trump administration did not waver, and respond with sufficient force to deter further use of the deadly weapons.

This example demonstrates that if we show weakness in the face of these horrific weapons, it will only invite continued use of them. We should also consider where the Assad regime acquired these weapons of mass destruction. Available evidence points to the Kim regime. And despite the Obama administrations deal with Putin, reports suggest Assad may be trying to acquire more chemical weapons from North Korea.

Last August, the United Nations revealed that two North Korean shipments destined for Syria were intercepted. While it is unclear what the cargo was, we know they were intended for the Syrian agency responsible for Assad's chemical weapons program.

So while Little Kim may not have ordered an attack with his chemical weapons arsenal yet, he is actively assisting those rogue actors who are using chemical weapons.

Recent reports also indicate that North Korea is developing the means to produce biological weapons on a massive scale. We do not know if he has deployed these new bio-weapons, but given the example he has shown with his nuclear and chemical programs, it is not unreasonable to believe they will be soon.

This evil regime has repeated demonstrated that it rarely hesitates when pushing the limits of international resolve. To prevent North Korea from expanding its arsenal of deadly weapons and proliferating them to the world's worst actors, we must continue to apply all pressure available.

Our sanctions should block all sources of funding and material for this regime. Only when Little Kim feels the pain and sees that his dangerous pursuit weapons of mass murder will result in his own demise, will he be tempted to back down. America must lead the way, and show that any use of these deadly weapons will be met with a harsh response.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF WILLIE O'REE BREAKING THE NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE COLOR BARRIER AND HIS INDELIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SPORT OF HOCKEY

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1958, sixty years ago today, a 22-year-old Boston Bruins winger stepped onto the ice of the famed Montreal Forum to battle the Montreal Canadiens, forever changing the face of the National Hockey League. Though he played in only two NHL games that year and forty-three more during the 1960–61 season, this player's lasting impact upon the League and the sport of ice hockey continues to this very day. In remembrance of his historic ac-

complishment, I want to take a few minutes to pay tribute to Willie O'Ree, on the anniversary of his becoming the first black person to play in an NHL game, and for his continued efforts to grow the game and personify the belief that hockey is for everyone.

Without question, life was not easy for the few black hockey players trying to break into the professional ranks in the 1950s. America was still dealing with segregation and Jim Crow, and racism was an everyday reality for black people everywhere. No black person was immune to this reality, not even a young black Canadian hockey player from Fredericton, New Brunswick. While chasing his boyhood dream of becoming a professional hockey player, Willie O'Ree faced more than his fair share of racial epithets and abuse from players and spectators alike. However, his inner strength, dedication, and determination propelled him above his racial antagonists and set him on a course that would ultimately prove historic and transformational.

And not only did Willie overcome the racial climate of his day, he also overcame a potentially career ending injury that almost no one knew about. When Willie was a 19-year-old playing junior hockey in Canada, he was struck by an errant puck that left him blind in his right eye. The doctors that treated him told him he would never play again. Thankfully for us, he followed his heart and not their prognosis. But Willie did keep the fact that he was blind in his right eye a secret from coaches, players, and even his family for fear that they might keep him from the sport he loved.

Following his time with the Bruins, Willie spent most of the remainder of his career in the Western Hockey League, where he played for both the Los Angeles Blades and San Diego Gulls. He ended a successful 21-year professional hockey career in 1979. However, the best was yet to come with respect to Willie's relationship with hockey and the NHL. For as much as he was a historic game changer on the ice in 1958, today he is recognized as one of most influential and respected advocates for the game off the ice.

In 1998, forty years after his initial impact as a player, Willie again significantly impacted the NHL and the game of hockey, but this time as the League's Diversity Ambassador and Director of Youth Development. Since reconnecting with the League, Willie has been a passionate and tireless teacher, mentor and friend to tens of thousands of young kids, from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, who have come to embrace and play the great game of hockey. His legacy continues to be on display in organizations like the Ft. Dupont Ice Hockey Club, here in Washington, DC, which is the oldest minority ice hockey club in North America, and SCORE Boston, an inner-city hockey program located in my district. Willie's legacy also can be seen through the NHL stars of today and the future stars of tomorrow. Last year's NHL All Star game featured the largest contingency of black players ever, with one of the players, Wayne Simmonds, being named the game's Most Valuable Player. Next month, Jordan Greenway, a member of the Boston University hockey team, will be the first African American to play hockey for the United States in the Olympics.

Earlier this week, we celebrated the national holiday honoring the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Universally recognized as one of the world's most eloquent and pas-

sionate defenders of civil and human rights, Dr. King, in his now famous "I Have a Dream" speech, talked of one day living in a nation where we will be judged not by the color of our skin but by the content of our character. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that during the same week we are celebrating Dr. King's legacy, we are acknowledging the accomplishments of Willie O'Ree: a man whose character allowed him to overcome the challenges surrounding the color of his skin and, in doing so, changed the sport of hockey forever.

DACA

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong and unwavering support of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (DACA) and unyielding opposition to the President's decision, announced by the Attorney General, to rescind a policy that liberated 800,000 young persons—124,000 of them in Texas—from the shadows of life, welcomed them into the mainstream, and encouraged them to realize their potential and achieve the American Dream.

At the heart of the Trump Administration's cruel and heartless and misguided decision to rescind DACA is the specious claim that President Obama lacked the constitutional and statutory authority to take executive actions to implement the DACA policy.

That is why I offered an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2018, (Division C of Rules Committee Print 115–31) that would have prohibited the Administration from using appropriated funds to implement its decision to rescind DACA.

Specifically, that Jackson Lee Amendment provided the following section at the end of Division E of the bill:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the Memorandum of September 5, 2017, from the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security pertaining to "Rescission of the June 15, 2012 Memorandum Entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children."

Regrettably, this Jackson Lee Amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

There was no need for the President to make any decisions about DACA; there was no real deadline pending, no actual court case, no legal requirement.

And in my congressional district, we are still mourning the loss of the heroic DREAMER, Alonso Guillen, who came to the U.S. from Mexico as a child, and died here when his boat capsized while he was rescuing survivors of the flooding caused by Hurricane Harvey in the Houston area.

The President and Attorney General should not have created a crisis just because they appear not to like the ethnic groups from which most DREAMERS come.

Not to mention the so-called President, who called "shithole countries" the places he finds undesirable, likely because of his racist ways.

There is no heart in ending DACA and leaving the fate of 800,000 young persons in limbo and at the mercy of a Republican Congress that has passed no major legislation and has no guarantee that the President would even sign a bill if they do.

Republicans in Congress need to bring H.R. 3440, the Dream Act of 2017, to the floor right now and vote for it so it can pass both houses of Congress with a veto-proof majority.

Mr. Speaker, now let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Pursuant to Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, the nation's Chief Executive, "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the "Take Care" Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., *Arizona v. United States*; *Bowsher v. Synar*; *Buckley v. Valeo*; *Printz v. United States*; *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has "prosecutorial discretion"—the inherent power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Thus, enforcement agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), properly may exercise their discretion to devise and implement policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize our nation's resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Mr. Speaker, deferred action has been utilized in our nation for decades by Administrations headed by presidents of both parties without controversy or challenge.

In fact, as far back as 1976, INS and DHS leaders have issued at least 11 different memoranda providing guidance on the use of similar forms of prosecutorial discretion.

Executive authority to take action is thus "fairly wide," and the federal government's discretion is extremely "broad" as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written by Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

"Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal." (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in *Arizona v. United States*, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of

individuals such as "[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families" or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

"Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law—embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service."

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation's international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution, or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy with respect to these and other realities."

Exercising thoughtful discretion in the enforcement of the nation's immigration law saves scarce taxpayer funds, optimizes limited resources, and produces results that are more humane and consistent with America's reputation as the most compassionate nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, a DREAMER (an undocumented student) seeking to earn her college degree and aspiring to attend medical school to —better herself and her new community is not a threat to the nation's security.

Law abiding but unauthorized immigrants doing honest work to support their families pose far less danger to society than human traffickers, drug smugglers, or those who have committed a serious crime.

President Obama was correct in concluding that exercising his discretion regarding the implementation of DACA enhances the safety of all members of the public, serves national security interests, and furthers the public interest in keeping families together.

Mr. Speaker, according to numerous studies conducted by the Congressional Budget Office, Social Security Administration, and Council of Economic Advisors, the DACA generates substantial economic benefits to our nation.

For example, unfreezing DAPA and expanded DACA is estimated to increase GDP by \$230 billion and create an average of 28,814 jobs per year over the next 10 years. That is a lot of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama did nothing was novel or unprecedented.

Let me cite just a few examples of executive action taken by American presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 "Mariel Cubans" were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure

(DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

In 1992, the Bush administration granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

In 2010, the Obama Administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Speaker, because of President Obama's leadership and visionary executive action, 124,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas have received deferred action.

Ninety-one percent of these immigrants are employed or in school and contribute \$6.3 billion annually to the Texas economy and \$460.3 billion to the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me note that DACA was and is a welcome development but not a substitute for undertaking the comprehensive reform and modernization of the nation's immigration laws supported by the American people.

Only Congress can do that.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges.

Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

Comprehensive immigration reform is desperately needed to ensure that Lady Liberty's lamp remains the symbol of a land that welcomes immigrants to a community of immigrants and does so in a manner that secures our borders and protects our homeland.

Instead of wasting time scapegoating DREAMERS, we should instead seize the opportunity to pass legislation that secures our borders, preserves America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world, and will yield hundreds of billions of dollars in economic growth.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BEV FITZPATRICK TO THE ROANOKE REGION

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, during my service in Congress, I have had the great opportunity to meet men and women in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District who exemplify what it means to serve. One of these individuals is Beverly T. "Bev" Fitzpatrick, Jr. I've had the great honor of knowing Bev for many years, and I have seen just how much of an impact he has had on the Roanoke region.

Bev grew up in South Roanoke. He graduated from Virginia Tech in 1970 and went on to serve in the United States Army. After his time in the military, Bev returned home to Roanoke. Over the years, he has worked in a variety of fields, including finance, economic development, education, public television, and